

1 KEVIN HAHN, #9821
NATHAN F. SMITH, #12642
2 MALCOLM ♦ CISNEROS, A Law Corporation
3 608 South 8th Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
4 Phone: (800) 741-8806
5 Fax: (949) 252-1032
Email: nathan@mclaw.org

6 *Attorneys for Federal Home Loan Mortgage*
7 *Corporation; M&T Bank*

8
9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
10 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

11 SUMMIT REAL ESTATE GROUP, INC.

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE
15 CORPORATION; FHLMC BANK, MITCHELL
LABORWIT,

16 Defendants.
17

Case No. 2:15-cv-00760-KJD-GWF

18 **STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER STAYING CASE**

19 On August 12, 2016, the Ninth Circuit released its decision in *Bourne Valley Court Trust v.*
20 *Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, a decision which may have a significant effect on this case. *See Bourne Valley*
21 *Court Trust v. Wells Fargo Bank, NA*, No. 15-15233, 2016 WL 4254983 (9th Cir. Aug. 12, 2016). The
22 appellant in *Bourne Valley Court Trust* has petitioned the Ninth Circuit for a rehearing *en banc*, which
23 the parties expect the Ninth Circuit to grant. Therefore, although the parties desire to continue
24 settlement discussions, they submit that the case should be stayed, pending the Ninth Circuit's decision
25 on the petition for a rehearing *en banc* and the Ninth Circuit's issuance of its mandate. The parties
26 respectfully request that the case should be stayed for a period of six months or until the Ninth Circuit
27 issues its mandate in *Bourne Valley Court Trust*.

28 A district court has the inherent power to stay cases to control its docket and promote the

efficient use of judicial resources. *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254–55 (1936); *Dependable Highway Exp., Inc. v. Navigators Ins. Co.*, 498 F.3d 1059, 1066 (9th Cir. 2007). When determining whether to stay a case pending the resolution of another case, a district court must consider (1) the possible damage that may result from a stay, (2) any “hardship or inequity” that a party may suffer if required to go forward, (3) “and the orderly course of justice measured in terms of the simplifying or complicating of issues, proof, and questions of law” that a stay will engender. *Lockyer v. Mirant Corp.*, 398 F.3d 1098, 1110 (9th Cir. 2005).

In this case, the parties submit that no damage will result from a six month stay of the instant case and that no hardship or inequity will be suffered by the parties, which have agreed to the stay. The parties further submit that the stay is warranted under the circumstances, based upon the Ninth Circuit’s decision in *Bourne Valley*, and the anticipated length of time that it will take for the Ninth Circuit to issue its mandate in that case.

Dated: September 22, 2016

Dated: September 22, 2016

/s/ Nathan F. Smith

/s/ Zachary T. Ball

Nathan F. Smith, #12642
Malcolm ♦ Cisneros, A Law Corporation
608 South 8th Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Phone: (800) 741-8806

Zachary T. Ball, #8364
The Ball Law Group
3455 Cliff Shadows Parkway, Suite 150
Las Vegas, Nevada 89129
Phone: (702) 303-8600

*Attorney for Federal Home Loan Mortgage
Corporation and M&T Bank*

Attorney for Plaintiffs

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 26th day of September, 2016



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE